_
Þ
\simeq
()
m
U
PTED F(
<u></u>
\Box
_
П
\sim
\cup
ת
,
\neg
PR
J
\bigcirc
\simeq
OCE
m
111
(J)
(1)
<u>~</u>
7
\(\)
(ı)
- 1
N
.~
ب
=
Ø
•
\succeq
늘
⋾
June 1
-
_
94:2
94:25 PM -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-29
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS -
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS - Page
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS - Page
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS - Page
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS - Page
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS - Page
9 4:25 PM - SCPSC - 2017-292-WS -

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER		DATE	June 19, 2019
MOTOR CARRIER MATTER		DOCKET NO.	2017-292-WS
UTILITIES MATTER	✓	ORDER NO.	

SUBJECT:

<u>DOCKET NO. 2017-292-WS</u> - <u>Application of Blue Granite Water Company (f/k/a Carolina Water Service, Incorporated) for Approval of an Increase in Its Rates for Water and Sewer Services</u> - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration Blue Granite Water Company's Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration of Commission Order No. 2018-802.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Blue Granite Water Company (f/k/a Carolina Water Service, Incorporated, and which I will call CWS for purposes of this motion) has filed a Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration of Commission Order No. 2018-802. CWS argues several points, including the assertion that this Commission earlier granted rehearing in order to determine the reasonableness of the utility's attorneys' fees in the case, but not the separate question of whether the expenses were reasonable and necessary to the provision by CWS of utility services to its customers. Therefore, it argues that a rehearing should be ordered with appropriate notice of the issues to be considered by the Commission.

Further, CWS has filed a Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration, and with it has submitted two Exhibits which deal directly with the Riverkeeper litigation that is the subject of the CWS Petition. The Company claims the evidence demonstrates significant benefits of that litigation to ratepayers. CWS asserts that it may provide such additional evidence pursuant to 58-5-330, which allows the Commission upon an application for rehearing to consider "all the facts, including those arising since the making of the order."

Since CWS has submitted new evidence pursuant to statute, and since it claims that the Commission needs to provide appropriate notice of the issues to be considered by the Commission on rehearing, I move that we grant rehearing and that the issues to be considered shall be the three grounds as enumerated in the Company's Petition. However, Ground No. 3 shall be modified to include the facts and issues raised by the Supplemental Memorandum and Exhibits in Support of CWS' Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration.

Further, I move that the order which results from this motion shall include a date by which the parties shall file briefs with the Commission regarding each party's position on:

1) whether rehearing should be carried out through the submission of briefs and oral argument, relying on the record as established in the September 2018 hearing and CWS' Supplemental Memorandum, or 2) whether additional witness testimony and exhibits would be needed to rehear the Riverkeeper Litigation issues raised by the Company.

PRESIDING	: <u>Randall</u>				SESSION: Regular	TIME: 2	::00 p.m
	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER			
BELSER				<u>Recused</u>			
ERVIN		✓					
HAMILTON		✓					

HOWARD	✓	✓	
RANDALL		✓	
WHITFIELD		✓	
WILLIAMS		✓	



RECORDED BY: J. Schmieding